Appendix

REPRINTED FROM REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT 5961-5967.

CLERK'S READING OF JURY'S ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES

"INTERROGATORY No. 1:

"Was there a conspiracy between Sunkist and Reliance that Sunkist would refuse to sell oranges to exporters for export?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 2:

"If your answer to INTERROGATORY No. 1 is 'Yes,' was the act of Sunkist and Reliance an unreasonable restraint of trade pursuant to such conspiracy?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 3:

"If your answers to INTERROGATORIES 1 and 2 are 'Yes,' was such conspiracy between Sunkist and Reliance the proximate cause of damage to the business or property of any of the following:

"John DeMartini Co., Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Ghiselli Bros., Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Honolulu Distributors, Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Paramount Export Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Sunrise Produce Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Liberty Gold Fruit Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Edward M. Bloch and Walter Loder d/b/a Pacific Produce Company?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Atlantic and Pacific Factors Robert L. Lepinay?"	Answer: "No."
"M-C International, Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 4:

"Is a relevant market applicable to the claim of monopolization what plaintiffs claim it to be: Oranges grown in Arizona and California for export to Hong Kong?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 5:

"If your answer to INTERROGATORY No. 4 is 'Yes,' did Sunkist possess monopoly power in that market?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 6:

"If your answer to Interrogatories No. 4 and No. 5 are 'Yes,' did Sunkist monopolize that market?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 7:

"If your answers to INTERROGATORIES 4, 5 and 6 are 'Yes,' did such a monopolization directly and proximately cause damage to the business or property of any of the following:

"John DeMartini Co., Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Ghiselli Bros., Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Honolulu Distributors, Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Paramount Export Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Sunrise Produce Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Liberty Gold Fruit Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Edward M. Bloch and Walter Loder d/b/a Pacific Produce Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Atlantic & Pacific Factors-Robert L. Lepinay?"	Answer: "No."
"M-C International, Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 8:

"Is there a relevant market applicable to the claim of attempted monopolization?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 9:

"If your answer to INTERROGATORY No. 8 is 'Yes,' did Sunkist have a specific intent to monopolize such relevant market?"

Answer: "Yes."

POOR COPY

"INTERROGATORY No. 10:

"If your answers to INTERROGATORIES 8 and 9 are 'Yes,' did Sunkist do one or more of the acts specified by plaintiffs in their attempt to monopolize claim, and if so, was any such act done wrongfully and in furtherance of that intent?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 11:

"If your answers to INTERROGATORIES 8, 9 and 10 are 'Yes,' did both elements—the intent and the act—together result in a reasonable probability that monopolization would sooner or later occur?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 12:

"If your answers to INTERROGATORIES 8, 9, 10 and 11 are 'Yes,' was such attempted monopolization the proximate cause of damage to the business or property of any of the following:

"John DeMartini Co., Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Ghiselli Bros., Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Honolulu Distributors, Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Paramount Export Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Sunrise Produce Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Libert[y] Gold Fruit Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Edward M. Bloch and Walter Loder d/b/a Pacific Produce Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Atlantic and Pacific Factors-Robert L. Lepinay?"	Answer: "No."
"M-C International, Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 13:

"Was there a conspiracy between Sunkist and Reliance to monopolize an appreciable amount of commerce in the export of oranges grown in Arizona and California to Hong Kong?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 14:

"If your answer to INTERROGATORY 13 is 'Yes,' did Sunkist and Reliance enter into such conspiracy with a specific intent to monopolize that commerce?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 15:

"If your answers to INTERROGATORIES 13 and 14 are 'Yes,' were one or more of the acts specified by plaintiff Association in its Section 2 claims done, and if so, were they done in furtherance of such conspiracy to monopolize?"

Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 16:

"If your answers to INTERROGATORIES 13, 14 and 15 are 'Yes,' was such conspiracy the proximate cause of damage to the business or property of any of the follow[ing]:

"John DeMartini Co., Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Ghiselli Bros., Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Honolulu Distributors, Inc.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Paramount Export Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."
"Sunrise Produce Co.?"	Answer: "Yes."

POOR COPY

BLEED THROUGH

"Liberty Gold Fruit Co.?" Answer: "Yes."
"Edward M. Bloch and Walter Loder
d/b/a Pacific Produce Co.?" Answer: "Yes."
"Atlantic and Pacific Factors-
Robert L. Lepinay?" Answer: "No."
"M-C International, Inc.?" Answer: "Yes."

"INTERROGATORY No. 17:
"Did any of the following at some time from February to October, 1966, enter into a conspiracy to prevent Sunkist from selling oranges to Hong Kong importers?
"Pacific Coast Agricultural
Exporters Association?" Answer: "No."
"John DeMartini Co., Inc.?" Answer: "No."
"Ghiselli Bros., Inc.?" Answer: "No."
"Honolulu Distributors, Inc.?" Answer: "No."
"Paramount Export Co.?" Answer: "No."
"Sunrise Produce Co.?" Answer: "No."
"Liberty Gold Fruit Co.?" Answer: "No."
"Edward M. Bloch and Walter Loder,
d/b/a Pacific Produce Co.?" Answer: "No."
"Atlantic and Pacific Factors-
Robert L. Lepinay?" Answer: "No."
"M-C International, Inc.?" Answer: "No."

(THE CLERK:) That completes the interrogatories, Your Honor.

So say you all?

(Affirmative responses from the jury.)

The verdicts have been read and the interrogatories read.

POOR COPY